



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,890	11/08/2000	Jeffrey Mark Bertram	16600.105005	3107

7590 03/06/2006
King & Spalding
191 Peachtree Street NE
45th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303

EXAMINER

OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/708,890	Applicant(s) BERTRAM ET AL.	
	Examiner Jonathan Ouellette	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-25 and 27-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-25 and 27-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>20050908</u> . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20051014</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-17, and 26 have been cancelled; therefore, Claims 18-25 and 27-81 are currently pending in application 09/708,890.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The rejection of Claims 19 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is withdrawn due to applicant's amendments.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 18, 31, 41, 48, 54, 66, 70, 73, 76, and 79** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
5. **Independent Claims 18, 31, 41, 48, 54, 66, 70, 73, 76, and 79** have been amended by the Applicant to include the negative limitation of, "displaying, *without the processing system receiving identification information from the passenger*, the passenger-specific boarding information on an electronic display coupled to the processing system." This

negative limitation was never disclosed or suggested in the specification, and therefore is rejected as new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
7. **Claims 18, 20, 28-32, 38-43, 45-50, 52-56, 62-63, 65-67, 69-70, and 72-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle (US 6,127,917) in view of Flint (Flint, Perry, "Being last is not always the worst thing," Air Transport World, v36n9, PP:68-69, September 1999).**
8. As per **independent Claims 18, 31, 54, 66, and 79**, Tuttle discloses a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific boarding information to passengers preparing to board for a departure comprising the steps of: transmitting [receiving] the passenger-specific boarding information to a processing system; and displaying the passenger-specific boarding information on an electronic display coupled to the processing system (C17 L58-67, C18 L1-25, communicates custom travel information).

9. Tuttle fails to expressly disclose wherein the passenger-specific boarding information comprises *one of* passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, passenger connection information, passenger-specific advertising.
10. Flint discloses a flight information system, which contains passenger specific boarding information such as: passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, and passenger connection information (pg.2).
11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included wherein the passenger-specific boarding information comprises *one of* passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, and/or passenger connection information, as disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by incorporating a large selection of passenger information.
12. As per Claims 20, 32, 55, and 67, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the electronic display is proximate to a departure gate (Flint: pg.2, gate agent display).
13. As per Claims 28 and 38, while Tuttle and Flint disclose confirming the passenger's identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers)
14. Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose clearing one of the passengers assigned a standby status to board; prompting the cleared passenger to board by displaying a prompt on the electronic display.

15. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger standby information for passengers (pg.2), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.
16. As per Claims 29 and 39, while Tuttle and Flint disclose confirming the passenger's identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers).
17. Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose approving an upgrade of one of the passengers; prompting the upgrade passenger to board by displaying the upgrade approval on the electronic display.
18. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger upgrade information for passengers (pg.2), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.
19. As per Claims 30, 40, and 69, Tuttle and Flint disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps (Tuttle: Fig.2, C17 L60-67, C18 L1-25).

20. As per Claim 56, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the remote computing system is coupled to a plurality of electronic displays (Tuttle: Fig.1, C17 L60-66, monitors).
21. As per Claim 62, Tuttle and Flint disclose a scanning device coupled to the remote computing system, the scanning device operable for collecting identifying data from a passenger (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers).
22. As per Claim 63, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the scanning device is further operable for displaying the passenger's seating information (Flint: pg.2).
23. As per Claim 65, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the scanning device provides the identifying data to the remote computing system for confirming that the passenger is permitted to board (Flint: pg.2 – data verification process inherent to gate-reader technology).
24. As per **independent Claims 41 and 76**, Tuttle discloses a computer-implemented method for providing passenger information to passengers preparing to board comprising the steps of: receiving the information for one of the passengers from a carrier data system at a computing system (C18 L5-8, access reservation system – information derived from carrier data system); in response to a signal indicating a designated time prior to departure from the terminal (C16 L37-55), displaying the passenger's information on an electronic display coupled to the computing system (C17 L58-67, C18 L1-16, communicates custom travel information), the passenger's information comprising a readily recognizable identifier for the passenger and corresponding flight information (Fig.3, C18 L17-25).
25. Tuttle fails to expressly disclose providing passenger seating information to passengers.

26. Flint discloses a flight information system, which contains passenger specific boarding information such as: passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, and passenger connection information (pg.2).
27. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included providing passenger seating information to passengers, as disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by incorporating a large selection of passenger information.
28. As per Claim 42, Tuttle and Flint disclose, upon attempting to board, reading the passenger's identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the computing system; and using the passenger's identity to confirm that the passenger is permitted to board (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers).
29. As per Claim 43, Tuttle and Flint disclose displaying the passenger's seating information at the scanning device (Flint: pg.2-3, electronic seating chart).
30. As per Claims 45 and 77, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose displaying passenger upgrade information on the electronic display.
31. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger upgrade information for passengers (pg.2-3), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by

providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.

32. As per Claim 46, while Tuttle and Flint disclose confirming the passenger's identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers)
33. Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose displaying the upgrade status for the passenger on the electronic display; determining that the passenger's upgrade is approved; displaying the passenger's upgraded seating information on the electronic display.
34. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger upgrade information for passengers (pg.2), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.
35. As per Claims 47 and 78, Tuttle and Flint disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in Claim 41 (Tuttle: Fig.2, C17 L60-67, C18 L1-25).
36. As per **independent Claim 48**, Tuttle discloses a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers in a terminal comprising the steps of: receiving the passenger-specific information from a carrier data system for one of the passengers at a computing device (C18 L5-8, access reservation system – information derived from carrier data system); and displaying the passenger-specific

information on an electronic display coupled to the computing device (C17 L58-67, C18 L1-25, communicates custom travel information).

37. Although, Tuttle does disclose displaying information selected from a customer/flight information database, Tuttle fails to expressly disclose displaying standby information.

38. Flint discloses a flight information system, which contains passenger specific boarding information such as: passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, and passenger connection information (pg.2).

39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included wherein the passenger-specific boarding information comprises passenger standby information, as disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by incorporating a large selection of passenger information.

40. As per Claim 49, while Tuttle and Flint disclose confirming the passenger's identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system/computing device (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers; Tuttle: C17 L31-36)

41. Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose determining the standby passenger is approved for boarding; based on the approval for boarding, displaying the standby passenger's seating information on the electronic display coupled to the computing device.

42. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger standby information for passengers (pg.2), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.
43. As per Claim 50, Tuttle and Flint disclose displaying the standby passenger's seating information at the scanning device (see rejection of Claim 49).
44. As per Claim 52, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose displaying standby availability information on the electronic display.
45. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger standby (standby availability equivalent) information for passengers (pg.2), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.
46. As per Claim 53, Tuttle and Flint disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in Claim 48 (Tuttle: Fig.2, C17 L60-67, C18 L1-25).
47. As **per independent Claim 70**, Tuttle discloses a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific boarding information to passengers preparing to board for a departure comprising the steps of: transmitting the passenger-specific boarding

information from a carrier data system to a processing system (C18 L5-8, access reservation system – information derived from carrier data system), wherein the passenger-specific boarding information comprises passenger information; displaying the passenger-specific boarding information on an electronic display coupled to the processing system (C17 L58-67, C18 L1-16, communicates custom travel information).

48. Tuttle fails to expressly disclose clearing one of the passengers assigned a standby status to board; and prompting the cleared passenger to board by displaying a prompt on the electronic display.

49. However, Flint teaches displaying/managing passenger standby information for passengers (pg.2), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to display the information incorporated in the system described by Tuttle, for the advantage of increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the system by providing customers with all necessary and essential information prior to boarding the airplane.

50. Furthermore, while Tuttle does disclose using a magnetic strip to identify a passenger at the boarding gate (C17 L31-36), Tuttle fails to expressly disclose confirming the cleared passengers identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system.

51. However, Flint discloses confirming the cleared passengers identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers).

52. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included confirming the cleared passengers identity by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system, as disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by incorporating passenger identification techniques to ensure correct/helpful information.
53. As per Claim 72, Tuttle and Flint disclose having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps previously recited (Tuttle: Fig.2, C17 L60-67, C18 L1-25).
54. As per **independent Claim 73**, Tuttle discloses a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for departure comprising the steps of: receiving the passenger-specific information from a carrier data system at a processing system (C18 L5-8, access reservation system – information derived from carrier data system); displaying the passenger-specific information on an electronic display coupled to the processing system (C17 L58-67, C18 L1-16, communicates custom travel information).
55. Tuttle fails to expressly disclose displaying passenger upgrade information, approving an upgrade of one of the passengers, and prompting the upgrade passenger to board by displaying the upgrade approval on the electronic display.

56. Flint discloses a flight information system, which contains passenger specific boarding information such as: passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, and passenger connection information (pg.2).
57. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included displaying passenger upgrade information, approving an upgrade of one of the passengers, and prompting the upgrade passenger to board by displaying the upgrade approval on the electronic display, as disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by incorporating a large selection of passenger information.
58. As per Claim 74, Tuttle and Flint disclose confirming the upgrade passenger's identity upon attempting to board by scanning a unique identifier for the passenger with a scanning device coupled to the processing system (Flint: pg.2, barcode-scanning gate readers; see rejection of claim 73).
59. As per Claim 75, Tuttle and Flint disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performed the steps previously recited (Tuttle: Fig.2, C17 L60-67, C18 L1-25).
- 60. Claims 21-25, 27, 33-36, 44, 51, 57-61, 64, 68, 71, and 80-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle in view of Flint, and further in view of Official Notice.**

61. As per Claim 21, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose projecting an idle mode screen, comprising general flight information, on the electronic display prior to transmission of the passenger-specific boarding information.
62. However, Tuttle does disclose maintaining a record of reservation/ticket purchases and departure times and only displaying passenger information if the departure time is in the correct range (C16 L1-41). Tuttle also discloses display operation mode changes related to electronic technology, in this instance a “sleep mode” for the communication tag in order to conserve power (C6 L60-65). Tuttle discloses displaying both departure and boarding information (C18 L5-16)
63. Finally Official Notice is given that electronic screen transitions (to include idle mode and various information screens) was well known technology at the time the invention was made, and commonly used for screen saving purposes, power management, information updates/changes, and idle indicators for public information terminals, ATM machines, etc.
64. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated screen transition technology in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by constantly maintaining information of interest displayed for all possible viewers.

65. As per Claims 22, 33, 58, 68, and 81, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the step of displaying the passenger-specific boarding information comprises a transition from an idle mode screen to departure mode screen (screen transition) in response to a first trigger event (departure time), the departure mode screen comprising *one of* passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, passenger connection information, and passenger-specific advertising (See rejection of Claim 21 and independent Claims 18, 31, 54, 66, and 79).
66. As per Claims 23, 34, and 59, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the first trigger event is a designated time before departure (See rejection of Claim 21 and independent Claims 18, 31, 54, 66, and 79).
67. As per Claims 24, 35, and 60, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the step of displaying the passenger-specific boarding information comprises a transition from a departure mode screen to a boarding mode screen in response to a second trigger event, the boarding mode screen comprising *one of* passenger seating information, passenger standby status, passenger upgrade status, passenger connection information, and passenger-specific advertising (See rejection of Claim 21 and independent Claims 18, 31, 54, 66, and 79).
68. As per Claims 25, 36, and 61, Tuttle and Flint disclose wherein the second trigger event is a designated before departure (See rejection of Claim 21 and independent Claims 18, 31, 54, 66, and 79).
69. As per Claim 27, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose wherein a departure mode screen and a boarding mode screen are displayed in association with the passenger-specific boarding information.

70. However, Tuttle does disclose maintaining a record of reservation/ticket purchases and departure times and only displaying passenger information if the departure time is in the correct range (C16 L1-41). Tuttle also discloses display operation mode changes related to electronic technology, in this instance a “sleep mode” for the communication tag in order to conserve power (C6 L60-65). Tuttle discloses displaying both departure and boarding information (C18 L5-16)
71. Finally Official Notice is given that electronic screen transitions (to include idle mode and various information screens) was well known technology at the time the invention was made, and commonly used for screen saving purposes, power management, information updates/changes, and idle indicators for public information terminals, ATM machines, etc.
72. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated screen transition technology (to include a transition from a departure mode information screen and a boarding mode information screen) in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by constantly maintaining information of interest displayed for all possible viewers.
73. As per Claim 44, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose printing a copy of the passenger’s seating information for the passenger.

74. However, Flint does disclose gate reader technology to include capturing passenger information (frequent flyer status, seat number) and integrating it with flight arrival and departure database information (pg.2).
75. Furthermore, official notice is given that printing technology was well known at the time the invention was made, to include printing organized information from a database.
76. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included wherein the scanning device is further operable for printing a copy of the passenger's seating information in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase customer service by providing a passenger with a personal hard copy of essential flight information for future use/direction.
77. As per Claim 51, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose printing a copy of the standby passenger's information at the scanning device.
78. However, Flint does disclose gate reader technology to include capturing passenger information (frequent flyer status, seat number, upgrade information, standby information) and integrating it with flight arrival and departure database information (pg.2).
79. Furthermore, official notice is given that printing technology was well known at the time the invention was made, to include printing organized information from a database.
80. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included wherein the scanning device is further operable for

printing a copy of the passenger's seating information in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase customer service by providing a passenger with a personal hard copy of essential flight information for future use/direction.

81. As per Claims 57 and 80, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose wherein the electronic display is further operable for rendering one of an idle mode screen, a departure mode screen, and a boarding mode screen.

82. However, Tuttle does disclose maintaining a record of reservation/ticket purchases and departure times and only displaying passenger information if the departure time is in the correct range (C16 L1-41). Tuttle also discloses display operation mode changes related to electronic technology, in this instance a "sleep mode" for the communication tag in order to conserve power (C6 L60-65). Tuttle discloses displaying both departure and boarding information (C18 L5-16)

83. Finally Official Notice is given that electronic screen transitions (to include idle mode and various information screens) was well known technology at the time the invention was made, and commonly used for screen saving purposes, power management, information updates/changes, and idle indicators for public information terminals, ATM machines, etc.

84. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated screen transition technology in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a

computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by constantly maintaining information of interest displayed for all possible viewers.

85. As per Claim 64, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose wherein the scanning device is further operable for printing a copy of the passenger's seating information.
86. However, Flint does disclose gate reader technology to include capturing passenger information (frequent flyer status, seat number) and integrating it with flight arrival and departure database information (pg.2).
87. Furthermore, official notice is given that printing technology was well known at the time the invention was made, to include printing organized information from a database.
88. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included wherein the scanning device is further operable for printing a copy of the passenger's seating information in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase customer service by providing a passenger with a personal hard copy of essential flight information for future use/direction.
89. As per Claim 71, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose displaying an idle mode screen, comprising general flight information, on the electronic display prior to transmission of the passenger-specific information.

90. However, Tuttle does disclose maintaining a record of reservation/ticket purchases and departure times and only displaying passenger information if the departure time is in the correct range (C16 L1-41). Tuttle also discloses display operation mode changes related to electronic technology, in this instance a “sleep mode” for the communication tag in order to conserve power (C6 L60-65). Tuttle discloses displaying both departure and boarding information (C18 L5-16)
91. Finally Official Notice is given that electronic screen transitions (to include idle mode and various information screens) was well known technology at the time the invention was made, and commonly used for screen saving purposes, power management, information updates/changes, and idle indicators for public information terminals, ATM machines, etc.
92. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated screen transition technology in the system disclosed by Flint in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to increase the effectiveness of the system/method by constantly maintaining information of interest displayed for all possible viewers.
93. **Claims 19 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle in view of Flint, and further in view of Carney (US 2002/0120518 A1).**

94. As per Claims 19 and 37, Tuttle and Flint fail to expressly disclose displaying passenger-specific advertising; wherein the targeted advertising is selected based on information about the passenger.
95. Carney teaches displaying passenger targeted advertising (gate destination/arrival) on an overhead screen in an airport environment (Fig.3, Para 33-34, Para 48).
96. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included displaying passenger-specific advertising; wherein the targeted advertising is selected based on information about the passenger, as disclosed by Carney in the system disclosed by Flint, in the system disclosed by Tuttle, for the advantage of providing a computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific information to passengers preparing to board for a departure with the ability to use the stored customer demographic information (reservation information) in order to increase revenue by offering customer specific advertising.

Allowable Subject Matter

97. The following claims would be considered allowable if amendment to read as follows:

Independent Claim 70 - A computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific boarding information to passengers waiting to board for a departure comprising the steps of: continuously transmitting and updating the passenger-specific boarding information from a carrier data system to a processing system, wherein the passenger-specific boarding information comprises passenger standby data; displaying the passenger-specific boarding

information on a gate information display system coupled to the processing system, and proximate to the departure gate; clearing one of the passengers assigned a standby status to board; prompting the cleared passenger to board by displaying a prompt on the gate information display system.

Dependent Claim 71 – acceptable as submitted by applicant.

Dependent Claim 72 – acceptable as submitted by applicant.

Independent Claim 73 - A computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific upgrade information to passengers waiting to board for departure comprising the steps of: continuously receiving and updating the passenger-specific upgrade information from a carrier data system at a processing system; displaying the passenger-specific upgrade information on a gate information display system coupled to the processing system, and proximate to the departure gate; approving an upgrade of one of the passengers; and prompting the upgrade to board by displaying approval on the gate information display system.

Dependent Claim 74 – acceptable as submitted by applicant.

Dependent Claim 75 – acceptable as submitted by applicant.

Independent Claim 76 - A computer-implemented method for displaying passenger-specific seating information to passengers waiting to board for departure, comprising the steps of: continuously receiving and updating passenger-specific seating information from a carrier data system at a computing system; in response to a signal indicating a designated time prior to departure

from the terminal, displaying the passenger-specific seating information on a gate information display system coupled to the processing system and proximate to the departure gate, the passenger-specific seating information consisting of a readily recognizable identifier for the passenger and corresponding seat assignment; clearing one of the passengers assigned a seat to board; prompting the cleared passenger to board by displaying a prompt on the gate information display system.

Dependent Claim 77 – acceptable as submitted by applicant.

Dependent Claim 78 – acceptable as submitted by applicant.

98. All remain claims should be cancelled or amended to reflect the changes as shown above.

99. The suggested claims are considered allowable because they disclose a unique passenger-specific display system that adds functionality to the displayed information by using it to individually direct passengers. The prior art fails to teach or suggest such a system/method for displaying and individually directing passengers/customers regarding standby, upgrade, and seat assignment information in an airline-boarding environment, as disclosed by the suggested independent claims.

Response to Arguments

100. Applicant's arguments filed 9/23/05, with respect to Claims 18-25 and 27-81, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

101. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

102. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


103. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Ouellette whose telephone number is (571) 272-6807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am - 5:00pm.
104. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306 for all official communications.

Art Unit: 3629

105. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

JO

March 3, 2006



JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600